America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 83 WWW.CODOH.COM September 2001

NOTEBOOK

Bradley R. Smith

Well, Willis Carto's Liberty Lobby has closed its doors and its weekly newspaper, *The Spotlight*, is finished. In July U.S. bankruptcy Judge S. Martin Teel Jr. dismissed the Lobby's latest claim for Chapter 11 protection. The end of the Lobby came about after the Institute for Historical Review won a multimillion dollar judgment against Mr. Carto on grounds that he diverted funds from IHR's parent company, the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, to his own interests.

At the end, *Spotlight* had about 90,000 subscribers, down from an estimated 300,000-plus in the early 1980s. Seven years ago, when IHR removed Carto from the organization, of which he was the principle founder, I had no idea all this was going to happen. At the beginning I didn't know about the money – some $17-million – nearly all of which "disappeared."

The trouble at IHR between Carto and the staff of the *Journal of Historical* review began long before the issue of money came up. I remember in the mid-1980s hearing Carto say that revisionist theory had done its work and that it was time to move on to

Continued on Page 5

Smith is one of the Top Ten Extremists in America

According to the ADL

Bradley R. Smith

Since 1983, Bradley R. Smith has effectively functioned as the Holocaust Denial movement's chief propagandist and outreach director in the United States. Smith was the first director of the Media Project of the Institute for Historical Review, he took Holocaust denial to TV and radio stations across the Nation. He achieved his greatest notoriety, however, as the director of the Committee for Open Debate of [sic] the Holocaust, whose mission is to disseminate denial to students on college campuses.

Quoted from the most recent article published as a booklet and on its World Wide Website by the Anti-Defamation League.

As noted here in **SR82**, The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL) has published a paper on the World Wide Web titled "Extremism in America" (1) where it lists the ten most dangerous extremists in the country. I find that I'm on the list – one of the most dangerous men in the land (there are no women on the list). I'm reminded of those serial murderers listed on the FBI's Most

Continued on Page 3

LETTERS

I look forward to your observations regarding Smith's Report *and the issues it addresses. I read everything you write. Oftentimes it influences how I handle the work. Unfortunately, I cannot reply to correspondence. Not enough hours in the day. I have space to print a very small number of your letters. If you do not want your name published in* **SR**, *please make that plain. Thanks.*

[What follows is a recent exchange of letters via E-mail. I had recently written an op-ed piece about terrorism and the Middle East and distributed it to those large campus papers that publish during the summer quarter. The piece has not yet been published, ASMarques had not seen it, but the subject was on my mind.]

There are Jewish folk who spend their time pointing out to me how Jews contribute to dissolving national entities based on blood and soil, and who at the same time claim that Israel, the priceless national entity based on blood and soil, should never be dissolved.

Alternatively, there are folks who try to convince me that the strong are entitled to rule and blood and soil should be the stuff of healthy culture & politics. They claim that Israel is a hellish entity because, well, down there the strong think blood and soil are the stuff of healthy culture & politics. Confusing.

Why in heaven is the Palestinian use of indiscriminate bombing worse than anybody else's much more indiscriminate bombing, such as area-bombing the enemy from the air? Or, alternatively, why is the Jewish incarceration and murder of Palestinians a worse sin than the German incarceration and murder of Jews was, when Germany too was -- according to the strong -- fighting for its life?

ASMarques

This gets sorted out pretty easily if one does not support the initiation of force to gain social or political goals, and if one thinks in terms of individuals rather than groups—standard libertarian ideas.

BRS

I agree with the method, but it's not easy to convince anti-libertarians *in power* that liberty is more powerful in the long run than their repressive ideas will ever be. Anyway I'm just *reminding* some folks of the facts of life, not trying to achieve conversions. I just think of myself as a sort of Pinocchio's cricket. It's the way I see my possible usefulness. Don't forget, I'm probably the only one on this list who actually lived for 26 years under one of those regimes [Portuguese] that were invented in the past century by the well-meaning, patriotic, religious, all-around good people sometimes called—for short—fascists.

I know a few things about the censorship of ideas that many of you may ignore and I like to occasionally express my dislike for those who think they are the ones who know which racial policies and which ideologies should be entitled to police enforcement in some future "New Order" of their own. While making good points on the present day hypocrisy concerning such stuff as the "Holocaust," some of these people are not exactly fond of libertarian ideas, and affirm the supremacy of flesh-blood-and-mind individuals over countries, races and other similar abstractions.

ASMarques

I wasn't really criticizing, just making an observation. I think the Palestinians were in the back of my mind. I should think most everyone wishes them the best, and that they are successful in liberating themselves from Israeli authority. Meanwhile, a Palestinian "hero" (and he was a "hero" in the way we use the word) has just killed a bunch of Jewish kids and some babies. Thinking groupthink rather than one on one.

BRS

One on one is better. The human bomb guy was a poor wretch and the Arab folks jumping up and down in the streets celebrating are misguided. No wonder here. Multitudes always are, even when one can perceive the reasons for their acting the way they do. I don't claim to know exactly what should be done. Not a very embarrassing claim, since this is one of the most problematic spots on the World. However, I do most definitely know what should *not* be done, what should be avoided. And that is: area-bombing and group-thinking.

ASMarques

No area bombing -- that is no killing of the innocent for the deeds of the guilty -- at the very least. No groupthink -- at the very least. Elegant, but easier said than done. I have many revisionist friends who do not buy it.

BRS

That's why there is no ideological core to revisionism. It's still simply a method, not an ideology, though a method with wide political implications that will sometimes be exploited in undesirable senses. Anyway, the less numerous the members of a group, the smarter it gets. Given sufficient numbers, a multitude becomes less smart than a caterpillar. Of course, revisionism will grow and grow, and we'll all pass away.

I have no recipes for Israelis or Palestinians, or Kurds or Tibetans or what have you. We can only hope people will somehow be able to reason one day. But propaganda lies are an important key to understanding contemporary history. That's one reason revisionism is so important. Truth has at least a chance in the long run. That's as far as I can see. Also no area bombing. That's the key to not becoming entangled with one's own enemies. Otherwise we grow very fast from pizzeria bombs to Dresden and Hiroshima: it's simply a matter of available power.

ASMarques

Your first sentence took me by suprise. "That's why there is no ideological core to revisionism." Never

occured to me to state it so simply. That's exactly it. I'll rip it off sooner rather than later. I remember Willis Carto speaking at an IHR conference maybe fifteen years ago remarking on the revisionist "movement" and he said -- "and it is a movement" -- and how my mind stopped for a moment because it had not occured to me that I had joined one.

BRS

One of the interesting things with revisionism, considering its potential political impact (maybe we can start talking about "actual" impact), is you don't detect any fundamental ideology subjacent to it, despite the "ism." Or rather, you detect just about every ideology dreamed off in the last couple of millennia, which is no small wonder given the small revisionist numbers. But those ideologies come on the fringes, not at the center. They travel with individuals and have little or nothing to do with "revisionism" itself.

At the center of revisionism is a simple and beautiful "idea," not an ideology which can be very complex but is a set of ideas distorted to fit simple minds. I think this single idea can be expressed thus: *Truth Saves.* This is a single idea, indeed an act of faith (actually the only possible one that has any chance of making sense), not an ideology or a voting contest or a dictator's whim or whatever. In my opinion, if it's right, there may be room for collective hope.

An "ideological" core is not necessary when nothing more complex is being treated than simply insisting on the core value that -- truth exists. Even libertarians and anarchists have ideologies and "programs." But the revisionist "program" is a skeletal one: "keep looking, make what you find available to others, and resist censorship as best you can." No room for party politics or ideologies here, unless one is talking of "anti-censorship politics".

Revisionism is simply the application of the scientific method -- the true one, not the Marxist farrago of pseudo-science -- to the field of history, including contemporary history. "Politics and propaganda" come only in the wake of imposed censorship, and that's how it should be.

ASMarques

+ + +

My life is something of an open book. **Smith's Report** *is not the place to write it. Nevertheless, I do report here on some of the distractions in my life that impact on the work. We live only one life, no matter how attractive the thought of compartmentalizing it might be. Every month I receive one or more letters from* **SR** *readers who have been prompted by something I have written about my life to tell me something about theirs. I seldom print these letters, and I feel very uncomfortable to have to say that I almost never respond to them, for the same reasons I do not respond to other correspondence -- time.*

I am printing the one below because it illustrates so well, in a very few words, the everyday lesson of awful experience, an uncomplaining acceptance of it, a sense of principle where nothing is owed, and the human need for beauty amidst it all that has been the message to me from so many of you.

I'm sorry for the long silence but in June last year my wife died and I fear a period of neurasthenia (do they still use that term?) overcame me. At the beginning of this year I was diagnosed with lung cancer and other boring medical issues. At any rate, I rather lost interest in everything and days, weeks went by without my opening letters and the like. I neglected everything. It was shameless. My conscience troubled me and yet I did nothing. I felt I could do nothing.

But now, in my second chemotherapy session (when my looking glass tells me I look ridiculous, like a character out of Beckett, in weakness and surrounded by wisps and sheaves of my hair, I'm sending you a check. How's that for a sign of recovery? It gives me great pleasure to send it to you before the quacks get the rest of what I have.

Your difficulties with Paloma are most distressing. I wish there was something I could say. Don't lose hope, above all keep writing. After a long silence, I'm back at it myself, though I tire easily. Your descriptions of the countryside and of sunsets and sunrises are especially good. Do write more about your more secular life and gives us some sunrises. Last summer and this one have had long, long nights and we can all use some of the purposefulness that your writing, in its quiet and understated way, embodies.

J.O'S. New York City

EXTREMISM Continued

Wanted list – it may be nice to see your photo on the post office bulletin board, but is it what you really want?

What have I done to be taken so seriously? Placing advertisements in student newspapers? Asking for some back and forth on a historical issue? Encouraging intellectual freedom, even with regard to the Holocaust question? Always with the cooperation of student editors, their business managers and faculty advisors? That makes me one of the top ten extremists in the nation? Maybe it just doesn't take that much anymore.

The ADL home page for Extremism in America shows a photograph of the Oklahoma City Federal Building after it was bombed by Timothy McVeigh, et al. Is that what intellectual freedom leads to? The mass murder of civilians and their children? I've never thought so. Intellectual freedom promises a non-violent exchange of ideas, encourages communication among disparate sections of the citizenry, creates confidence in an open society, and has the inherent characteristic of illuminating every public issue, as if in the light of day, so that secret societies and special interest groups are open to the same scrutiny as ordinary individuals.

The one common thread among those on the ADL's Top Ten list of extremists in America is that they are

all involved with the White racialist movement. I'm the one exception, but I made the list anyhow. How? In a free society racialist theory should be on the table for open debate, but I have never been a member of a racialist organization or promoted racialist ideology. It wasn't a difficult decision for me to make. I didn't have to wrestle with my soul. The first barrier for me was the last. I have always disliked how too many racialists use the language. There are many individual exceptions, but a rule of thumb appears to be to use the language in a way that is both vulgar and self-defeating.

Why am I the only designated extremist in the ADL's Top Ten who is not part of the racialist movement? I think we all know why. Because anyone who questions the orthodox version of the Holocaust story, particularly the homicidal gassing chambers, "hates Jews." While this is a childish, if not a stupid concept, it has worked in America for half a century so there is no reason for ADL Jews to let it get away from them. Jews are not much of a race, but when it comes to the science and rewards of victimlogy it is very good business for ADL Jews to consider Jews to be something "like" a race, an "ethnic" group, or, as the man most responsible for the founding of Israel used to say, a "people."

I think many individuals in the Industry sincerely believe that only someone who hates Jews could possibly question the gas chamber stories. These are not stupid people, but they have allowed themselves to be stupefied by their own rhetoric. For these people, hating Jews is just as bad, worse, than hating Blacks and the "mud" people. Others in the Industry certainly feel that questioning the gas chamber stories is *probably* anti-Jewish, so while they are not certain they don't want to take any chances and urge its suppression on principle. And then there's the problem that those who work for the Industry either make their living suppressing revisionist theory, or would have their income affected negatively by speaking out in support of intellectual freedom on the question. For many of these fighters-against-hate then, it's a bread and butter issue.

The author of Extremism in America is not listed, but is most likely Jeffrey Ross. Jeffrey is the fellow in charge of the "campus desk" at ADL headquarters in New York City. He's been on my case for ten years now. Everywhere I run an ad it's been Ross's job to see to it that the staff of the student paper, its faculty advisor, and the president of the college is contacted and chastised, urged to publish a condemnation of the ad, and warned to not make the same mistake again.

In Extremism in America Jeffrey has given me my own page, complete with photograph, background information, and then a history of my extremist actions and accomplishments. My page is titled "Bradley Smith / The Committee For Open Debate of [sic] the Holocaust (CODOH)." The first line of my personal background is my date of birth, January 18, 1939. Jeffrey got the year wrong, and he got the month wrong, but one out of three isn't that bad when I recall what the ADL has produced about me over the years. It's not important, but I was born on 18 February 1930.

I always imagined Ross to be a nervous, thin little guy with a beard, about thirty years old maybe. No mature person would describe me to student editors as "scum," as Ross has. But the other day I saw a photograph of Jeffrey Ross. He's twenty or thirty years older than I imagined him to be, has no beard, he's not short, he's putting on weight, and looks more or less like a small town college professor or businessman. He looks normal. These people can fool you.

I see too that ADL is still circulating the old story that Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH) was "initially funded by William Curry," a Nebraskan businessman. It's not true. I've told them it's not true, I've repeated on radio that it's not true and reported in my newsletter (which Jeffery is very familiar with) that it's not true, but they like the story so here it is again. William Curry had nothing to do with the initial funding of CODOH. In the first place, CODOH didn't have any initial funding. CODOH was founded the day I typed up a letterhead that read Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH), and had some copies made at my Iranian-Jewish copy shop on Highland Boulevard in Hollywood. I think I had fifty copies printed and the bill was about two dollars and fifty cents. And that was it.

It's not really very important one way or the other – what difference would it make -- but I have always wondered, why do the ADL folk keep repeating the statement when they know I deny it and they have no proof that it is true? What's in their heads? I needed funding. I certainly would have accepted funding from Mr. Curry if he had offered it, but he didn't. I had never met the man when I founded CODOH, never talked to him, never to my recollection received a note from him. Nothing. Yet here it is again. Why? I think I have finally realized what this is all about. Jeffery (I will take it as a given until I learn differently that Jeffrey is responsible for Extremism in America) has put something together which must have been on his mind all this time, something that just never occurred to me.

In Extremism is America Jeffrey writes that in 1986 Curry attempted to place a full-page ad in the *Daily Nebraskan*, the student newspaper at University of Nebraska. It was refused. Curry then offered $5,000 to the university to pay for a speaker who would debate revisionist theory at an academic conference. The offer was refused. He wrote letters to the editor of various newspapers, and disseminated his ideas through mass mailings.

> *These four tools – purchasing ad space in student newspapers, sponsoring debates, writing letters to the editor and sending direct mail – were all adopted by CODOH....*

That's it then! At last! It's pure speculation, it's all wrong, but there is in fact a clear logic of coincidence to it. I do remember talk about Curry's full-page ad and how it was refused,

though I don't think I ever saw the text. I do remember talk about the $5,000 offer to debate revisionism being refused. I don't know anything about Curry's letter writing campaigns or the mass mailings. In 1986 I was doing radio. I had my hands full with it. But the story makes sense if you want it to. William Curry tried to publish a full-page ad in a campus newspaper so that's what gave me the idea to do it. He offered money to get a debate going over revisionist theory, so I followed his lead. And why wouldn't I? After all, William Curry "initially funded" CODOH. It's all nonsense. But at last I see the "logic" in Jeffrey's obsession with William Curry and CODOH.

As a matter of fact, in addition to William Curry not initially funding CODOH, I do not remember that he ever contributed any money whatever to CODOH or to me. Not a dime. Maybe he did. But I do remember one afternoon a few days before Christmas when we were still in Hollywood and I received a $400 check from a revisionist organization that Curry was affiliated with. It was about 1987. The check was a lifesaver. We didn't have any money at all. I felt so grateful that I got Curry's phone number from a mutual friend and rang him up. I had never spoken to him. I identified myself. It must have been about eight o'clock in the evening in Nebraska. I thanked him with some fervor for the check and started to go on about it when he interrupted me.

Curry said: "I didn't send you any money. I don't want your thanks."

I was stopped in my tracks. I mumbled some apology and hung up. It turned out that my friend Fritz Berg, who was also affiliated with the same organization (I don't remember now what it was called) had sent me the money.

A couple years later I did meet William Curry. I was invited through a mutual friend to spend the weekend at his winter home in Borrego Springs in the desert south of Palm Springs. Curry was probably in his seventies then, white haired, rather an invalid, and needed an oxygen tank at his side
during dinner. His manner was what we used to call "crusty." There were maybe eight of us at a lively supper table, including his charming wife. He asked me how I had gotten into revisionism and I told him the story about reading Faurisson's paper on Auschwitz and the Rumor of the Gas Chambers, and how I had sensed immediately that something was wrong with the stories.

"That was short and clear," Curry said. " That's what I like."

I had the impression that he had asked that question of others and had gotten some long-winded answers. I asked him how he had gotten into revisionism and he related an anecdote about how after the war in Europe he had met a G.I. at a bar in England (maybe it was Germany) who told him that the stories about the Dachau gas chambers were not true. Curry said: "I looked into it and found out that the Dachau gas chamber was crap. Afterwards I looked into the other gas chamber stories and found out they were crap too. Sometimes I think the whole goddamned war was crap."

Sometimes I think the same thing. No – that's what I think about it every time I think about it. I would like to have gotten to know William Curry better, but I had to return to Hollywood that night, my mother was having a problem, and I never saw him again.

Meanwhile, I'm back in action with the dreaded Campus Project. Now that I have become aware (again) of how important my work is to the ADL, how closely its agents read everything I publish, I will report here only after the fact on the upcoming successes (and failures) of the new Campus Project for the 2001 – 2002 academic year. I'm looking forward to it.

CODOH ON THE INTERNET

The accesses to documents on CODOHWeb are in the normal summer "slump." Students are off campus until the fall quarter, the citizenry in general is moving about, going on vacation, doing summer things. So I was surprised when I added up the figures.

During July documents on CODOHWeb were accessed 577,210 times. I really didn't expect such a high count. Not only because we are in the summer "slump," but because the Campus Project has been very low key since the first of the year, which translates into CODOHWeb getting much less publicity that it normally would have had. And it was interesting to note that of the 577,000-plus hits on CODOHWeb, almost 160,000 of them were accesses to our E-zine – ***The Revisionist*** ("E-zine" is Internet jargon for "electronic magazine"). That is, almost one-third of the hits on CODOHWeb these days are accesses to ***The Revisionist*** – "Americas only Holocaust Revisionist E-zine."

Paul Grubach, who has written for the Journal of Historical Review, is being read by an increasing number of people in ***The Revisionist***. He's producing opinion pieces as well as longer critical articles. Those that are being read now include: "An Open Letter to Deborah Lipstadt" and "Why Won't Deborah Lipstadt Debate the Holocaust Revisionists?" There is a short piece on "Hunting Demjanjuk: Injustice, Double Standards, and Ulterior Agendas," and a sharp reply to the ADL's latest on Smith: "A Revisionist Response to the Anti-Defamation League: Bradley Smith, His Publications, and the Charge of Extremism." Most recently we have published his 7,600-word essay "Israel, Zionism, and the Racial Double Standard." These are each what we call "hard-hitting," and are all on the mark.

J. P. Bellinger's "Can I Sell You a Testimony?" was one of the top ten pieces during July, John Weir had two opinion pieces that were being read:

Richard Widmann, Editor in Chief of ***The Revisionist***, is represented in the Top Ten month after month, usually with more than one piece. His three articles listed here have become "must reading" for those who sign in to ***The Revisionist***. These three "perennials" are "George Orwell," "How Fahrenheit 451 Trends Threaten Intellectual Freedom", and his most recent opinion piece "The Holocaust Happened."

The Founding Myths of Israeli Politic, by Roger Garaudy, "The Suppressed Eichmann and Goebbels Papers" by David Irving (from the Journal of Historical Review), and the "Speech of Reichsführer-SS Heinrich Himmler at Posen 4 October 1943" trans. by Carlos Porter have become "standard" works for those going to CODOHWeb for months now.

Something of a surprise to see in the Top Ten is Samuel Crowell's "Defending Against the Allied Bombing Campaign: Air Raid Shelters and Gas Protection in Germany, 1939-1945," as it is a long technical work. But then Crowell is the author of *The Gas Chamber of Sherlock Holmes*. It is published on CODOHWeb and anyone who reads even a part of it will want to become familiar with anything whatever written by Crowell.

And then there is "Hot Links," compiled by CODOH (technically) but in reality compiled almost entirely by David Thomas, our volunteer (he has oftentimes "paid" for the privilege of being a CODOH volunteer) Webmaster. Hot Links is "A Guide to Web Services, Strange Pages, and Reference Resources. It would take a substantial essay to describe what Hot Links consists of.

For the first time I have printed out the Index (19 pages), and a couple sub indexes, "Banned Books On-Line (6 pages), and "Tangled Web: The Consequences (21 pages) which is chock full of Internet sites that deal with the "consequences" of the U.S. Congress funding Israeli Government policies for the last half century.

If you do not have access to CODOHWeb, these three indexes to Hot Links will give you a good idea of the breadth and depth of what we make available. You'll be surprised.

46pp. Plastic cover. $12

NOTEBOOK Continued

other issues. He wanted to use the *Journal* to address the issues that were being addressed by *Spotlight*. I was never employed by the *Journal* but I had "signed on" with the Institute to take revisionism public, not get involved in the Fed, racialist issues, conspiracy theories or – any of the other stuff that *Spotlight* was involved with.

By 1992, after years of nagging and pressure from Carto, the editorial direction of the *Journal* moved in his direction. From that point on there was on average maybe of one racially tinged article, review, quote, etc. per issue. I remember early on in this period when the *Journal* published an article by Jared Taylor, editor of the excellent *American Renaissance*. It may have been the first (if I recall correctly) overtly "racial" article to be published in the *Journal*. I felt betrayed by this turn in events. I felt something was about to come apart. I wrote an angry letter to the editor protesting, not the article itself which was a good article, but the *Journal* having published it. The letter was published and I made some enemies and lost some supporters.

Then, during the second Mermelstein trial Ted O'Keefe and others who were helping trial lawyer Mark Lane prepare IHR's case, it was discovered that some $10-million dollars that should have gone to the Legion for Survival/IHR had somehow "disappeared." Not only that – but Carto had known about the bequest and had not "mentioned" it to anyone at the Institute. Why?

Then there was one thing after another. While never taking legal responsibility for IHR, Carto involved IHR and its employees as defendants in two copyright infringement suits. After IHR had won the Mermelstein libel etc. suit, Carto pushed to sue Mermelstein for malicious prosecution against all competent advice. He made quixotic publishing decisions without consulting staff at IHR, such as contracting to pay Leon Degrelle upwards of a quarter million dollars for his Hitler hagiolatry, and then ordering it published by IHR, not Noontide.

The underlying problem from the start was that Carto wanted to run a non-profit foundation staffed by idealists, who were giving up any possibility for a career in mainstream life, as if it were his own private business being run for his own private interests. He wanted to be the principle figure in the organization, exercise full authority, be the behind the scenes managing editor of the Journal, run the institute's board of directors, and all the while attempting to take little or no legal responsibility. So Liberty Lobby is finished, *Spotlight* is finished, IHR is struggling, and millions of dollars are "missing." Missing from IHR, that is. We may never know if it is "missing" indeed.

Mark Weber, IHR's present director, told *The Washington Times*: "This is a welcome culmination of an exhausting, costly, bitter legal and public relations dispute." *The Times* goes on to note that "Mr. Weber has been assailed in the pages of the Spotlight as a "rat," "weasel," "toilet bowl," "cockroach" and "devil." They left out "mutt," which is how Mrs. Elizabeth Carto refers to him in personal letters.

This vulgar language has a familiar ring to it. The Carto's are not what Hemmingway would describe as particularly graceful under pressure. Mark Weber does not use such language. I am reminded of this lack of grace not merely by the quote from *The Washington Times*, but by an incident that happened a few months ago while I was preparing to have supper with a traveler from Germany. I found him at our dining room table

reading an open letter written by Mrs. Elizabeth Carto addressing the weaknesses of my character in a very direct manner. Elizabeth has the right to write what she wants, but I was astonished to find that the letter was a photocopy of one she had written me in 1994 – seven years ago! This was shortly after she and her husband had been tossed out of the IHR – which could never have happened if they had maintained a legal association with it. Elizabeth was upset, I understand that. But to still be distributing the letter after seven years?

A good part of her letter, aside from the personal insults, was critical of my friendship with Andrew Allen. *The Spotlight* has spent endless buckets of ink smearing Allen as an ADL agent. I've never bought the stories, and I don't know anyone who knows him who has. Allen bought me my first computer back in 1990 and has helped me ever since, including as recently as this year when I was on the road with my daughter. Maybe he's in what is called "deep (very deep) cover."

Checking back, I see that with **SR17** I had defended Allen against some of the worst smears published in *Spotlight*. In **SR18** I published Elizabeth's letter condemning me, and my response to it. Then I recalled that after a few months Willis had written me an 18-paragraph letter so insulting that it puts Elizabeth's tasteless and rather non-rational letter in the shade. I published Willis's letter in **SR24** and my responses to it, paragraph by paragraph.

And that was more or less it. Or so I thought. I have been aware for some time, several years really, that a month seldom passes that I do not receive a letter asking me to respond to the charges made against me by one Carto or another. I don't read *Spotlight*, and I don't "follow" the Cartos comings and goings, so I have been uncertain what charges are being referred to. But a couple months ago when I found my German friend reading a photocopy of a seven-year-old letter from Elizabeth Carto I kind of "came to." The Cartos, or at least Elizabeth, is still distributing the slanderous letters they wrote about me six and seven years ago! While most of the charges are badly put, and while some are pathetic, it is only natural that those who receive these old letters wonder how much of them are true.

Maybe you're one of those who has asked me about these charges in the past to which I did not reply, or maybe you have some interest in this behind-the-scenes affair that I lost interest in when I thought it was over.

If so, in exchange for a contribution, I'll send along the three issues of ***Smith's Report*** that deal with it. **SR17** (Spring 94) gives my reaction at that time to the charges made against Andrew Allen in the *Spotlight* up to that time. The charges never ended, Carto was desperate to blame others for the consequences of his own behavior, but I don't think I returned to the subject. **SR18** (Fall 94) contains Elizabeth's letter to me (in which she repeatedly refers to Mark Weber, in that classy way she has, as "mutt Weber") and my response. **SR24** (June/July 95) contains Willis Carto's unusually small-minded letter, and my response to it paragraph by paragraph.

I have made many mistakes, missed many opportunities, and have many weaknesses of character. It's difficult for me to understand how the Cartos could ignore them all and address what they do address in their letters – which *they are still distributing!* My article on the Allen affair, and the two Carto letters and my replies to them, will give you a small insight into how an organization like Liberty Lobby and a publication like the Spotlight, which together raised tens of millions of dollars, if not several hundreds of millions, fell apart because of little more than the sensibilities of those who ran them.

According to *The New York Post* a German bank is financing a resort, including a luxury hotel, golf course and tennis courts, designed around Eagle's Nest at Berchtesgaden, Adolf Hitler's old mountain hideaway. It will be managed by a British company. Thirty million dollars, 146 beds. The hotel itself will go up on land once owned by Hermann Goering.

Abe Foxman thinks it's a "sick" idea. Simon Wiesenthal says it's not so bad: "Hitler traveled all over Germany. Do we say you can't build anywhere just because he has been there?"

Wartime bombing virtually destroyed the complex – and troops later razed what was left of Berghof to avoid it becoming a shrine for neo-Nazis, who still make a pilgrimage there every April 20 – Hitler's birthday.

It's not difficult (for someone like me) to imagine that once the project is finished that "pilgrims" to the site will have access to a level of upscale partying that has not previously been available to them.

Last month I reported that the Hungarian parliament has "refused to discuss measures which would make Holocaust denial [sic] a punishable offense because that would threaten freedom of speech." Now I can report that Estonian President Lennart Meri has called on his country's parliament to declare "equally criminal totalitarian tyrannies of the right and left," an appeal that seems certain to renew the debate about the nature of the crimes of Hitler and Stalin. This is an important move in the right direction. At the same time, it obscures the primary issue.

BLUNDERS & BUSINESS

I spelled Extre[a]mism wrong on the front-page headline in **SR82**.

I included an illustration of the sticker -- **THE HOLOCAUST QUESTION** -- but gave no price for them. It's 10 for $1, 50 for $4, and 7 cents each for 100 or more, all post-paid.

You keep pointing out to me that I do not yet have a notification date on our address labels telling you when your sub is up. I'll have to fix that. Meanwhile, if you will, please check your records. July and August are awful months around here.

Why should the regimes of Hitler and Stalin be declared criminal? Because they took the "lives, freedom, families (and) property" of innocent people. Where does that leave us, and the Estonian President, with respect to the victims of democratic regimes, which have a centuries-old history of committing those very crimes? We have only to reflect on the behavior of the British and French empires with respect to Africa, India and the Middle East, and the American involvement with Africans and Native Americans, to know that there is an unfinished issue here.

It's time to start peeling the labels off of this kind of "criminality" and look at the thing itself. It's not an issue or left and/or right. The thing itself is tyranny – the initiation of force against others. If tyranny is wrong for those labeled fascists, Nazis and communists, it's wrong for Republicans and Democrats as well. This isn't complicated, but there are some who do not want to see it in its simplicity. .

I lived in New York City and Hollywood for thirty years. I remember when it was still fashionable to hear friends repeat the old saw that Hitler did evil, and Stalin did evil too, but "Stalin did evil so that good might come of it." Once I got involved with revisionism, my social circles changed somewhat (heh, heh), and I don't hear that old saw any longer. Now I hear, or hear it implied, that the "democracies" (and particularly America) do evil so that good might come of it."

I don't think so. The democracies – America – does evil because the US Congress doesn't have the least idea how to be a light unto the world without killing the innocent for the deeds of the guilty. I would argue that we stop labeling criminality based on the ideology of the accused and get focused on criminal acts that actually take place, particularly in our name. For starters we could begin by withdrawing our financial support for Zionist/Israeli tyranny, and stop our ten-year bombing campaign against Iraq.

Rabbi Avi Shafran (Jewish World Review, July 27, 2001.) writes that "The most elemental events of Jewish history have been denied even by some Jewish Religious leaders, several of whom have famously gone on record rejecting the historicity of the Exodus, the revelation at Sinai and the conquest of the Land of Israel at the time of Joshua."

Denial, denial! Where's it going to end?

A couple weeks ago my wife and I had to go to the other side and while I was driving North on the freeway at about seventy miles per hour there was something like an explosion and I couldn't see out the windshield. It was shocking. It took an instant to realize that the car's hood had lifted up, blown back and shattered the windshield. I couldn't see because the hood was still up there. I couldn't see out the rearview mirror either and that confused me. The two side rearview mirrors were intact. A minute or two later we were on the shoulder and parked. I saw then why I couldn't see out the back window. The hood had smashed against the windshield frame with such force that it had blown the rear view mirror out of its mooring and into the back seat.

We tied the hood down, drove back to town on the shoulder at about fifteen miles per hour, left the car at a body shop, and called it a day. I thought about how when the hood smashed into the windshield I was shocked, but I wasn't scared. There was real danger, but no fear. I was completely focused on taking care of business. Reflecting on the incident I was reminded of the theory about how fear comes from thought. It had happened so quickly I hadn't had time to think, so I hadn't been afraid. I recalled other experiences I'd had where I was in danger but "thought nothing of it" and did what I was supposed to do. Often as not, I did the right thing.

There's something about this that goes beyond not being afraid only when we are in sudden physical danger. At any moment a belief or viewpoint that gives us a sense of security, place and well being can be competently challenged. We feel threatened. It's possible, in fact, that what we believe is wrong. We feel uneasy. Instead of letting opinion go and seeing things as they are, like when your windshield is shattered and you *can't* see but have to act anyway, we can argue "blindly" against whatever threatens us.

That's what those in the H. Industry do. They've had time to understand that their core belief is being threatened competently. They don't want to see the thing as it is, so they argue, for example, that I am one of the top ten extremists in the land. It's ludicrous. It's comic. Who am I? If those folk want to have an end to their anxiety and bad temper, they are going to have to step back from opinion, look at things as they are, and give up what they can plainly see isn't going to work. That'll do it.

The 2001 – 2002 academic year is upon us. Your contribution will help fund the Campus Project. There is a good deal that can be accomplished if I have the necessary help. As you know, there's no one else.

Bradley

Smith's Report

is produced by
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29 you will receive eleven issues of
Smith's Report
Canada and Mexico $35
Overseas $39

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, California 92143

Telephone: 619 685 2163

Tel & Fax (Baja):

011 52 661 23984

E-mail: brsmith@telnor.net